

Documentation and Evaluation of Seattle City Partner Activities for the Arts Participation Leadership Initiative

A Report to the Washington State Arts Commission

October 2010

Report by Claudia Bach, Principal
AdvisArts Consulting, Seattle

advisarts
consulting



Documentation and Evaluation of Seattle City Partner Activities for the Arts Participation Leadership Initiative: A Report to the Washington State Arts Commission

The following provides a snapshot and synthesis of documentation and evaluation information related to entities serving as City Partners for The Wallace Foundation's Arts Participation Leadership Initiative (APLI) cities between 2006 and September 2010. The report includes recommendations for the Washington State Arts Commission on tools and approaches for documenting and evaluating its work as the sole Seattle City Partner from 2009 through 2012.

Context and Background

In 2009 the Washington State Arts Commission (WSAC) was selected as the City Partner for The Wallace Foundation's Seattle Arts Participation Leadership Initiative (APLI). The City Partners are focused on supporting the learning of organizations in the region related to the Wallace initiative's Wallace Excellence Awards (WEAs). In Seattle there are nine WEA recipients, each receiving between \$500,000 and \$750,000 over the four year grant period of 2009 to 2012. The City Partners role is intended to build on The Wallace Foundation's goals for this initiative of enhancing effective practices as a means of introducing more people to rewarding arts experiences, and to encourage knowledge sharing and use of successful practices within the cultural sector. As in the other five cities where the Wallace initiative is underway (Boston, Chicago, San Francisco, Philadelphia, and Minneapolis/St. Paul) the work of the City Partner in Seattle is to share knowledge broadly within the city's arts sector, connecting with the foundation of the WEA recipient cohort, and stretching the impact of the Wallace initiative in the region.

WSAC in 2008 defined the goals for this work in the Seattle region as:

- To develop the skills and expertise of leaders of arts organizations to build arts participation, especially among youth and young adults and diverse populations reflecting the changing demographics of the Puget Sound region.
- To build the capacity of arts organizations to expand access to the arts through new technology.

To accomplish this work, WSAC proposed in 2008 to use nine coordinated strategies:

- 1) **WEA Cohort:** Establish a cohort of arts organization leaders from the nine WEA recipient organizations to learn with and from each other. Initial learning will focus on arts participation framework and changing patterns in cultural participation.
- 2) **Seattle Forums:** Convene forums featuring outstanding speakers, for arts leaders and managers from the broader region to build learning and collegiality throughout the sector in a creative, arts-centric format.

- 3) **Workshops:** Present a series of sequential workshops annually, beginning Fall 2009, in Seattle and two other communities in the Puget Sound region, as small group settings for applied learning.
- 4) **Research and Responses:** Commission twelve working papers/artistic responses on such topics as changing demographics, new technology, or trends in arts participation. These articles or artworks will inform and/or document the learning sessions.
- 5) **Technology Network:** Establish and maintain online resources to post information and artistic responses, share learning, convene conversations, etc.
- 6) **Arts Grants:** Develop and implement a program to regrant Wallace Foundation funds for two-year projects by Seattle arts organizations not otherwise funded through the WEA, to achieve one or both of the following goals:
 - a. build arts participation among younger and/or more diverse populations OR
 - b. expand access to the arts through new technology.
- 7) **Technology Grants:** Develop and implement a program to regrant Wallace Foundation funds to Seattle arts organizations not otherwise funded through the WEA, for technology upgrades that will enhance arts participation in the changing demographics of our region.
- 8) **National Conferences:** Support WEA grantees' or other arts organizations' participation in national convenings or the equivalent professional development opportunities. Also support travel to meetings with other Wallace City Partners nationally.
- 9) **Assessment:** Document and evaluate the results of this initiative to inform and summarize the work of WEA leaders, leverage further learning and investments, and provide a useful project record. Includes annual meetings with Arts Funding Colleagues to gain their input.

Seattle City Partner activities and components to date

As the project has progressed, the nine proposed strategy areas have been refined, and in some cases revised. Importantly, there has been the development of three interrelated groups of arts organizations who are targeted by WSAC for inclusion and involvement, in different ways. These are:

1. The nine Seattle **Wallace Excellence Awardees (WEAs)**:
 - Experience Music Project/Science Fiction Museum and Hall of Fame
 - On the Boards
 - One Reel
 - Pacific Northwest Ballet
 - Seattle Art Museum
 - Seattle Opera
 - Seattle Repertory Theatre
 - Seattle Youth Symphony
 - SIFF (Seattle International Film Festival/Cinema Seattle)
2. **“Community of Practice” (CoP) groups**, the six cohorts identified and developed with the consulting firm Meaning Matters that include, in total, over 85 organizations:
 1. Festal, Seattle Center, ethnic festival groups
 2. Shunpike Arts Leadership Lab, Seattle, a coalition of emerging arts organization managers

3. Shunpike Arts Leadership Lab, Tacoma, a coalition of emerging arts organization managers
 4. Broadway Center, Tacoma, performing arts organizations in residence at the Broadway Center
 5. King County Local Arts Agencies, including city government and regional nonprofits
 6. and, the WEA cohort of nine organizations
3. **Other arts organizations of all sizes and artistic disciplines in the region** interested in participating.

The key components of WSAC's work as City Partner, accomplished so far are:

- A. Convening the WEA cohort twice annually.
- B. Developing the Community of Practice groups and providing them with opportunities for learning from experts and as a cohort.
- C. Holding forums and workshops (August and November 2010) open to all three of the targeted audiences.
- D. Expansion of online resources for information and shared learning via the WSAC website, including webinar opportunities related to workshops.
- E. Commissioning of initial "research and response" projects by artists and thinkers based on aspects of the initiative's goals or activities.

Additional planned components are:

- F. Providing grants (regranting of Wallace APLI funds) to Seattle area arts organizations:
 - a. \$20,000 to 5 Community of Practice entities for arts participation projects (\$10,000 a year for two years)
 - b. \$10,000 to organizations for technology upgrades relevant to the APLI

In addition to these components, WSAC seeks to document and evaluate its City Partner APLI work (as noted in strategy #9 above.) This is driven both by their agreement with the funder, The Wallace Foundation, and also by the desire to capture and learn from the process, so as to maximize the work in a deeper and more effective way in the region.

Researching a plan for documentation and evaluation in Seattle

In July 2010 WSAC hired Claudia Bach of AdvisArts Consulting to develop options and recommendations for evaluating and documenting its work as City Partner for the Seattle APLI. This effort was intended to build on the experiences and best practices of other City Partners in Wallace-funded cities around the country, especially those that are now in year 3 or 4 of the initiative. The intent was to examine what has been learned in other APLI cities to determine how WSAC can best document and assess its work throughout the remaining grant period in an intentional and useful manner.

Material was provided to the consultant by WSAC on their activities, as well as proposals, agreements and reports to The Wallace Foundation. This was augmented by conversations with WSAC staff and documents created by Meaning Matters for work with the Communities of Practice in Seattle. Questions for telephone interviews were developed based on this information.

Interviews were conducted with key City Partners representatives in each of the five other APLI cities. The following individuals generously shared their experiences and opinions related to evaluation and documentation for this initiative:

1. Mark Smith, Massachusetts Cultural Council, Boston
2. Suzanne Conner, Chicago Community Trust, joined by Deborah Johnson Hall, Johnson and Associations Marketing, Chicago
3. Tom Kaiden, Greater Philadelphia Cultural Alliance, Philadelphia
4. Kary Schulman, Grants for the Arts, San Francisco
5. Christine M. Taylor, Arts Midwest, Minneapolis

Interviews were also held with The Wallace Foundation's Senior Research and Evaluation Officer, Anne Stone, Daniel Windham, Arts Director at The Wallace Foundation, who shared their perspectives on the same set of questions. These interviews were complemented by communication with WSAC APLI consultants Alan Brown of WolfBrown, and Gerald Yoshitomi of Meaning Matters.

Conversations with Anne Stone and Daniel Windham provide some important, if not directive, context for City Partners documentation and evaluation. The primary driver behind the Foundation requiring or encouraging City Partners documentation and evaluation is that any such efforts serve and benefit the local (city) arts community. At this time there is no formal plan within The Wallace Foundation for synthesis of City Partners documentation or evaluation, though there may be some form of distribution at a later date. There is openness to thinking how such information might be shared via, or within, the Foundation.

Annual reporting, which all City Partners complete, is the basic tool measuring compliance with the grant contract. Documentation and evaluation is seen by The Wallace Foundation as reaching beyond that baseline level of compliance in important ways, and is meant to focus on reflection and learning on the part of the City Partners and participants. It is fundamentally about telling the story of each City Partners' engagement and the journey related to new learnings, trends, strategies or identifying inconclusive arenas that may suggest additional investigation. It is hoped that such exploration identifies and provides ways to share practices and activities that will benefit that particular city's collective arts sector.

City Partners approaches to documentation and evaluation

In each city the City Partners have tackled the interrelated issue of documentation and evaluation somewhat differently. All have wrestled with the purpose and scope of these functions before settling on how they would approach this aspect of their role.

In general, City Partners express that there was little prescription from The Wallace Foundation regarding this aspect of their work. In each city there was a clear relationship between The Wallace Foundation's research function as it related to data collection with the WEAs, but nothing similar regarding the City Partners. There was lack of clarity on how any data collected by City Partners might be used across the six cities initiative, and whether there was a need to gather information in ways that might be used as comparable data.

In most communities, except Seattle, the local community foundation was paired with a leading public entity as the City Partners team, with that foundation serving as the financial conduit of grant funds, and the other entity generally providing the implementation. This pairing created a *de facto* core planning team for the initiative. In most cities this team was further augmented by either additional partners or members from the arts, funding and/or marketing community, and in some cases, representatives from some or all the local WEAs or regrantees. These planning groups, whether formal or relatively informal, have met fairly regularly and appear to have been a source of input leading to decisions on how documentation and evaluation fit within the larger range of local goals and activities. It should also be noted that in at least two cities an individual (either a consultant or contract position) was hired as part of the team to play a lead administrative role.

These "teams" generally serve as the body that shares and reflects on the activities undertaken with some regularity, making use of any data collected. The existence of such a relationship or group, and the need to share information among the players, appears to spur reflection about any data collected, and to then help shape next steps, revisions or course corrections for City Partners activities.

In most cases, the City Partners have taken little or no responsibility to evaluate the work of the WEAs. The focus of documentation and evaluation is the City Partners-generated activity. This may include the WEAs, but it is generally reaching out beyond them.

Below are snapshots of how the five cities are approaching documentation and evaluation, based on telephone interview conversations and any additional materials provided by the individual interviewed. For some cities, documentation and evaluation is closely tied to how that City Partners identified their goal(s) for the initiative overall, while for some there are specific goals for evaluation.

- **Boston** (now in year 4) saw its primary focus as "establishing a community of learners related to audience engagement." To gather information on its efforts at building a learning cohort and developing a culture of conversation, they hired (in year 2) a journalist who attended selected activities and has interviewed individuals at each of

the 22 participating sites (WEAs plus all regrantee recipients) to develop a story based on qualitative data. Its work with 15 regrantees made strong use of a logic model template as the foundation for planning, documenting, and evaluating those organizations' projects over two phases. The Boston City Partners plan to do a print publication to give to the 22 participants, and to make this available to other organizations. It was noted that the 22 participants did not feel a strong need for such a publication, but the City Partners believe it can benefit those beyond that cohort.

- **Chicago** (now in year 4) spent considerable time aligning its role with existing arts engagement priorities. They have chosen to undertake an assessment of the initiative's "impact on the participants and the aggregate community." They have hired a consultant (in year 4) who will use multiple techniques to gather insights, information and data. They will seek to collect any data gathered by those involved over the course of the grant period (though most did not gather impact measures.) They also plan to use additional tools, such as interviews and focus groups. Overall, they intend to gather a retrospective picture and to examine "perceptual measures of change" as a result of exposure to the initiative, in a range of participating organizations.
- **Philadelphia** (now in year 3) has been driven by its stated outcome of "doubling participation in the arts in Philadelphia by 2020." It should be noted that the confluence of Wallace and Pew funding helped to shape the scope, reach and stated outcome in Philadelphia. A key element of the work has been the creation of the *Cultural Engagement Index* (with Alan Brown) which serves as a benchmark. They are now engaged in the second round of using this tool and they would hope to see a 12% increase in participation to keep them on the right trajectory towards their ambitious goal. In Philadelphia, research, documentation and evaluation are core elements of the work, which is further augmented by workshops, conference scholarships, and regranteeing. The *Cultural Engagement Index* fulfills many aspects of documentation and evaluation as an inherent characteristic of its use.
- **San Francisco** (now in year 3) decided to focus on demographic change and new technologies as both opportunities and challenges. They ended up "planting a million seeds" to see what came up. This includes convenings, both large and small, commissions from individuals in a variety of art and scholarly forms (which will serve as documentation, though not their key purpose,) creation of The Big List, workshops, regranteeing for marketing plans, and upgrades to the web site with creation of a related iPhone app. They see their evaluation as fairly "primitive" -- mostly quantitative in response to Wallace-requested output measures and basic surveys. They have examined such data along with their planning partners' opinions and that has helped to shape each step forward. They are exploring the idea of hiring someone to look at everything collected and to consider options for how to do a retrospective synthesis or analysis for themselves.

- **St. Paul – Minneapolis** (in year 2) has decided to hire a “documentarian” for the full length of the grant, to create continuity and “collect stories since there was no baseline or storyline” for the initiative as an evaluative framework. They felt their capacity was limited for trying to measure long lasting change so they are focusing their efforts on creating a history of the project and looking at impact “in a soft way.” The documentarian attends selected events at which she does brief informal interviews with a few participants. She also is developing case studies to explore learning in 2 organizations from among the 14 organizations who are receiving Americans for the Arts training through the initiative. There will also be case studies exploring the experiences of some recipients of National Arts Marketing Conference Project (NAMP) scholarships to look for “aha!” moments. They intend to create some form of printed document as well as a version for electronic distribution, with the hope that this can inform local funders, who will need to be the backbone of support for any continuation of such work in the community.

In addition to the approaches outlined here, all five cities used basic survey tools to gather various kinds of “participant satisfaction” and “participant profile” data related to specific events. Such information was used to plan future events and programs but was not seen as having the ability to really capture impact on, or change among, participants in any significant way, and has not generally shed light on larger questions related to evaluation.

Key methods and tools used by City Partners

A variety of tools and methods for documentation and evaluation are in use by the five City Partners investigated. Ten tools and methods are described here. They have been selected based on their reoccurring usage among City Partners and based on having relevance for WSAC.

1. Collection of participant satisfaction and participant profile data is widely used for gathering data related to City Partners-generated short term educational interventions.
2. Collection of data from organizations receiving City Partners regranting funds. City Partners are using various methods, including logic model templates, for RFPs, planning, reporting, reflecting on, and evaluating, related to regranting.
3. Focus groups, roundtables or interviews are used to gather qualitative data from program participants or the cultural community (often building on focus groups used in planning program components at the start of the initiative.)
4. Requesting any data collected by WEAs and/or City Partners grantees as a way to broaden documentation and evaluation. This is often to garner quantitative data, and in some cases, has happened retroactively.

5. Commissioning of responses or research in connection with aspects of the initiative (artistic, scholarly or other) from independent individuals. This method has brought additional eyes and voices to examine the City Partners work and ranges from very open-ended approaches to more specifically defined projects.
6. Case studies to look more in depth at the learning and change that occurs in one or more participating organizations, in connection with the City Partners work. Often this looks at a selected number of organizations from among those who have received reganting funds.
7. Meetings of a team or planning body, such as multiple City Partners in that city, an advisory group, or other methods likely to spur reflection and review for the initiative's progress. Often the focus is on program planning or course correction, and generally the information available for review is quantitative data on participation from City Partners programs, and informal exchange.
8. Visual and/or media documentation and dissemination related to City Partners programs and activities. Most often, this is material presented on the web, covering such things as presentations, and using tools such as presentation slides, documents, video or photographs, and webinars as follow ups. It may include comments and blogging but such interactive tools are not reported as being used extensively.
9. Hiring an individual to document and to carry the responsibility for gathering information and crafting "the story" for part, or all, of the initiative's lifespan. This person may be a journalist or a consultant who may, or may not, be focused on traditional forms of data collection.
10. Compilation and/or synthesis as a means of summing up as an historical or dissemination document (electronic and/or print.) This may tie in to contracting a single "storyteller" (#9) or may be done either by a staff member from one of the City Partners or by an individual hired to create a retrospective report. This may be intended primarily for those who participated in the initiative, or to reach out to the regional cultural community and funders, or for national distribution.

Recommendations for WSAC as Seattle City Partner

There are commonalities across the methods and tools used by the other five City Partners and some valuable lessons to build on for Seattle. While there is clear benefit in considering methods or tools used elsewhere, there is no standard format nor is there a need to try to align methods and tools with other cities: No overarching documentation and evaluation framework has been proposed by The Wallace Foundation, and there is currently no planned method for compilation or analysis of City Partners material that points towards standardization.

The combination of tools and methods recommended here has been selected with the internal capacity of WSAC in mind, as it is understood by the consultant. In proposing an approach for WSAC the consultant has selected a variety of components that can examine and provide the full story of Seattle City Partner activity, while striving for simplicity and consistency. Seven recommended components for documentation and evaluation for the Seattle City Partner are described here:

Recommendation 1.

Create a Seattle City Partner Steering Committee. Identify and regularly convene (at last two times a year) an ad hoc City Partner steering committee (or other title) of no less than 6 and no more than 12 individuals -- including WSAC staff-- to periodically review the initiative's status and components. This group should make use of any forms of documentation and evaluation collected, to reflect on the initiative, and use such information to inform and recommend possible adjustments for future City Partner activities. This group would also be charged with consideration of how to sustain the most effective strategies emerging from the grant period, and sowing the seeds for such sustainability. Such ideas might include ways to create ongoing Communities of Practice, ongoing needs for particular technical knowledge or learning, ways of sharing information within the sector or subsectors, etc. It is suggested that this group include members of the Arts Funders group that has been informed about the Seattle project.

Recommendation 2.

Identify key initiative goals to be tracked. With the steering committee, identify and commit to a few (2 to 5) key aspects of the initiative WSAC wishes to explore, track and analyze for the duration of the initiative. All tools used should then be aligned to have a way of contributing to this exploration. It seems likely that such goals should explicitly include new technology and demographic shift measures. Note: Meaning Matters has suggested some possible success/outcome measures for CoP participants that should be part of such a discussion.

Recommendation 3.

Continue to collect participant surveys. Post-event Survey Monkey surveys are being used by WSAC to gather general participant satisfaction, learning, and profile data. These tools should be reviewed and potentially revised to reflect the key goals identified (#2) and to examine new learning gained related actions that participants plan to take, and strategies they plan to use. There are two options for analysis of this data:

- a. Data compilation and analysis by program staff or consultant, and presentation to the steering committee to provide information for 1.) future program and events planning, and 2.) reflection on key goals and benefits in the community.
- b. Aggregating such data over the life of the project and creating a more substantive analysis, either as a stand alone piece or part of a larger overview document. Such work is likely to require the services of a contracted consultant, based on current WSAC staff resources.

Recommendation 4.

Continue to make workshop and forum content available online. Providing the content from workshops and forums is a form of documentation. Slide presentations, PDFs of documents, videos and/or webinars become a timely as well as a long term record. Those who choose to attend webinars might also be surveyed, in keeping with #3 above.

Recommendation 5.

Develop a case study “change portrait” from each Community of Practice. The CoP structure and WSAC’s intent to use “research and response” commissions suggest a method to explore how participation in the learning community cohorts has had an impact on an organization. It is recommended that six two-person “research and response” teams be identified and each one assigned to document and develop a portrait of change in the work of a single CoP organization for the duration of the initiative (3 years.) This could focus on elements related to use of technology and participation among young adults and/or diverse populations, or other key goals identified. A set of basic parameters should be provided to guide each team, but significant leeway can be left to the team on the method and end product. One team member could be an artist (such as media, visual, literary, performing, etc.)

It is suggested that the teams be proposed and selected by the steering committee to streamline the process. These six commissions would take the place of the other commissioned work proposed by WSAC, and the six completed pieces should be collected together and assembled for electronic distribution via the WSAC website (and potentially Wallace or other sites as well.)

Recommendation 6

Use a simple logic model template for City Partner regranting to organizations. WSAC intends to regrant funds for building arts participation and access, and/or meeting technology needs. It is suggested that all regranting follow a similar method of documentation and evaluation. The logic model format can provide a foundation for proposal application, first year reporting and revisions, and final reporting. This template can also include questions related to the key goals identified in #2 above. The format used by the Boston initiative should be explored as a possible resource.

Recommendation 7

Create and present a summary document and event. Such a document should focus on what has been learned by individual organizations and the Seattle area cultural sector. It should describe the initiative components that have been most useful in positioning Seattle area organizations to build effective practices, and how the region might best continue to stay open and aware of continuing change and knowledge. It is suggested that a writer, journalist or consultant (individual or team) be identified in year 3 and be contracted prior to year 4. There are two options identified for this summary document:

- To only utilize the information and materials described in the 6 previous recommendations as primary source materials; or
- To augment the information and materials with one or more of the following:
 - A focus group with the full steering committee
 - Focus groups with 3 or more CoPs
 - Interviews with selected individual members of the steering committee, CoPs, and presenters
 - Interviews or focus groups with individuals who attended at least two City Partner events or programs, but who are not a member of a CoP.

The final document should be made available online, and if possible, in print. A presentation to the Seattle region cultural sector should be a capstone element of the Seattle City Partner's role. This presentation should focus attention on the accomplishments related to the initiative and identify any continuing elements that have emerged. These might be tangible plans by WSAC or other funders or organizations, and/or the ideas of the steering committee for how to leverage and sustain what has been learned, and invite others to step forward for the future.

In addition to these seven recommendations, WSAC should consider the staffing needs for keeping these forms of documentation and evaluation moving forward in synch with the multiple APLI program components. This is a multi-faceted initiative and at this point in the initiative it may be worthwhile to consider if staff capacity is adequate for the project's dimensions, and if not, whether there is the potential to reallocate grant funds to attend to such needs.

Related issues regarding City Partners roles and relationships

The following ideas are offered here for reflection related to the initiative overall. They are not specific to the WSAC recommendations, but have emerged as thoughts and questions that may be of use either for WSAC, other City Partners, or The Wallace Foundation. They reflect the observations of the consultant based primarily on the research for this report.

1. City Partners partnerships and planning groups may be pivotal in **creating a hub of thinking** in a city or region. In some of the other cities, these were marriages of convenience and in some, true and deep partnerships. In communities where invested voices came to the table, close to the City Partners, there appears to be a stronger and richer reach for the initiative. The involvement of WEAs is also a dimension that would be worth exploring. Consultants or subcontractors often play a role as part of the planning group or by providing administration to link various players. These individuals seem to be of particular importance to this work in cases where such roles bolster City Partners capacity for the work of the initiative.

2. There was considerable searching done on the part of the City Partners to understand The Wallace Foundation role related to City Partners documentation and evaluation. City Partners had questions related to the funder's goals for this partnership role, and wrestled with defining what outcomes they, as City Partners, could reasonably try to accomplish and measure. There was **interest in receiving guidance** on methods and tools that might be most effective and beneficial for comparison across the six cities. And there was curiosity about how the funder might compile or share the materials generated by the City Partners.
3. The City Partners in the six cities form a potential but **untapped learning community**. The cohort of City Partners met once (in Philadelphia in 2009) and most expressed an appetite to be able to share and learn from each other. All those interviewed hoped to receive info from this WSAC-generated exploration as a way to better understand their work in the context of the other City Partners.
4. This initiative suggests an **opportunity for a multi-site analysis** of sustainable capacity building in a community. The purpose of evaluation during this initiative has been stated as primarily benefiting the local community, however, this initiative has the structure to look deeply and broadly at some larger questions including: What value did this learning have for the participants and what are commonalities or differences across the cities? Where does quality of learning interaction get measured? What role does the creation of a social network (informal or more formal, such as a Community of Practice) play in creating something sustainable? Is offering a one-time program truly worthwhile? What is the relative value of a sequence or multi-session program? None of these City Partners alone has the capacity to undertake that kind of research or analysis, especially over the long term, in their own community, and it is beyond their missions to look across the breadth of the City Partners cohort.
5. **Preparing for the post-funding landscape** is an undercurrent of any such initiative or episodic infusion that builds activity (and often expectation,) only to fade away as the funding ends. Some cities are exploring how to hand off the convening roles for various groups but it appears unclear who is likely to carry such work forward. In some cases, the WEAs may be best positioned to do this as a group, but this raises questions for City Partners regarding the more inclusive group they have touched. Community collegiality, rather than competition, is something that some City Partners have tried to attend to in light of the funding disparity between Wallace grantees, recipients of City Partners regranting, and those who received no funds. Creating a sustainable local or regional network of learners is challenging, and may not receive the focus it deserves, among all the programming demands of City Partners during the grant period.

Next Steps and Conclusion

WSAC is now positioned to craft a clear approach to documenting and evaluating the Seattle City Partner experience. The Seattle APLI is well into its second year and it seems most beneficial to take decisive action on documentation and evaluation tools and methods, and to commit to a timeline for the duration of the project. APLI programming continues, and major events are planned for November, so there is urgency to move forward as quickly as possible. Next steps should include:

1. Internal staff review of the report and prioritization of the recommendations, preferably within 2 weeks of receipt of the report.
2. If Recommendation 1, to develop a steering committee, is accepted, a selection of desired committee members should be asked to review this report and share opinions on the priorities the staff has selected, preferably within 4 weeks of the completion of this report.
3. Based on the priority recommendations selected, identify those to be undertaken internally and those requiring additional contracts, and develop any needed RFPs, as well as clarifying any budget adjustments required with The Wallace Foundation.
4. Develop or revise tools and templates.
5. Develop or revise a timeline for collection of documentation and data, and a related timeline for analysis and review of such materials, through the end of the grant period.
6. Consider how best to share this information with other City Partners and the initiative's funder.

The recommendations here reflect the consultant's opinion on how such work might be best accomplished. The information, however, leaves lots of opportunity for WSAC to selectively pursue tools and methods to create a compelling and useful record of this important initiative.

* * *

Many thanks to the individuals noted in this report who agreed to be interviewed, and who generously shared their time and knowledge with candor and clarity.

AdvisArts Consulting Claudia Bach, Principal 7702 14th Avenue NW Seattle, Washington 98117
206.789.2418 office 206.915.0192 cel claudia@advisarts.com www.advisarts.com